Applicant: Stephen C. Olson Attorney's Docket No.: 02243-039001

Serial No.: 10/721,241

Filed: November 26, 2003

Page : 9 of 11

REMARKS

Claims 16-29 and 49-74 are pending, with claims 16 and 55 being independent. Claims 16, 19 and 25 have been amended and claims 49-74 have been added by way of this response. Claims 1-15 and 30-48 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 25 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended claim 25 to address the Examiner's concern.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 16, 19, 22, 25-27 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Trost (U.S. Patent No. 3,229,918). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16, in part, recites a one-piece manifold having a front face and a rear face. The one-piece manifold includes a grinding chamber, a feed inlet, a gas inlet, and an outlet.

The fluid grinding mill of Trost does not describe or suggest a one-piece manifold as claimed. The Examiner has equated the body member 11 of Trost to the claimed one-piece manifold, the classification chamber 44 to the claimed grinding chamber, the hopper 74 and nozzle 78 to the claimed feed inlet, and the nozzle 79 to the claimed gas inlet. While the monolithic body member 11 (Fig. 4) includes a front face 12 and a classification recess 13, the monolithic body member 11 of Trost does not include a grinding chamber. In Trost, the classification chamber 44 is formed by a separate, rear liner plate 34 (Fig. 1) secured to the body member 11, a separate, trapezoidally shaped deflector 38 (Figs. 1 and 7) secured to the forward face of the rear liner plate (such as with screws 41), and a separate peripheral liner band 36 (Fig. 1). The monolithic body member 11 of Trost does not include a feed inlet as claimed, as the hopper 74 and nozzle 78 of Trost are separate elements from the monolithic body member 11. The body member 11 of Trost does not include the claimed gas inlet, as the nozzle 79 is a

Applicant: Stephen C. Olson Attorney's Docket No.: 02243-039001

Serial No.: 10/721,241

Filed: November 26, 2003

Page : 10 of 11

separate element from the body member 11. These separately secured, discrete liner elements do not comprise a one-piece manifold. Further, the liner elements of Trost are intentionally provided as individually replaceable and interchangeable liners that can be replaced readily and quickly (see col. 1, lines 42-58 and col.6, lines 3-10 of Trost). Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Trost.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost in view of Coombe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,840,188). Claims 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost in view of Fay (U.S. Patent No. 3,559,895). Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trost in view of Andrews (U.S. Patent No. 2,032,827). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Coombe, Fay, and Andrews do not overcome the deficiencies in Trost discussed above. In particular, none of the references describe a one-piece manifold as claimed. Therefore, claims 17, 18, 23, 24 and 28 are patentable over Trost, Coombe, Fay and Andrews.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the Examiner's characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, Applicant may have not addressed all characterizations of the art and reserves the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application. The absence of an explicit response by Applicant to any of the Examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the Examiner's positions. The fact that Applicant's comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

Applicant: Stephen C. Olson

Serial No.: 10/721,241

Filed: November 26, 2003

Page : 11 of 11

Applicant submits that all of the claims of the present application should be allowed.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney's Docket No.: 02243-039001

Date: November 4, 2005

Matthew T. Shanley Reg. No. 47,074

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W. 11th Floor Washington, DC 20005-3500

Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40306849.doc